NOTES TO *J.Q.R.*

I.

SCHĀM (שאם) ALS NAME PALÄSTINA'S.

In seinen überaus dankenswerthen reichen Mittheilungen aus den Kairoer Geniza-Fragmenten [1] stellt E. J. Worman auch die Erwähnungen der beiden alten Synagogen von Fostat zusammen, die mit ihren arabischen Namen als כניסה אלשאמיין (oder כניסה אליהוד אלשאמיין) und כניסה אלעראקיין bezeichnet werden. Neben diesen arabischen Namen finden sich in den Documenten der Geniza auch die hebräischen Namen כניסת הירושלמיים und כניסת הבבליים. Der Verfasser vermuthet zwar, dass diese hebräischen Namen die Aequivalente jener arabischen Bezeichnungen seien, aber ganz sicher erscheint ihm das nicht; und was die erstere der beiden Synagogen betrifft, stellt er die Hypothese auf, dass sie zuerst die "Synagoge der Jerusalemier" hiess und später unter dem Einflusse von neu angekommenen Gemeindemitgliedern aus Damascus die "Synagoge der Syrier" (oder Damascener, denn שאם bezeichnet auch Damascus) genannt wurde. Aber diese Hypothese ist ganz überflüssig, und jener Zweifel an der Identität der mit den hebräischen und den arabischen Namen bezeichneten Synagogen ist unberechtigt. Denn שאם bedeutet nichts anderes als ארץ ישראל (Palästina), und עראק nichts anderes als בבל. Saadja in seinem Jezirah-Commentar (IV, 3, ed. Lambert, p. 76, Z. 2) bezeichnet die palästinensischen Juden als אהל אלשאם, die babylonischen Juden als אהל אלעראק. Speciell die Anwendung von שאם als Bezeichnung Palästina's, aber auch Jerusalem's ist in der arabisch-jüdischen Litteratur vielfach nachzuweisen. Jephet b. Ali übersetzt הצבי, Daniel viii. 9, mit אלשאם (s. seinen Commentar zu Daniel, ed. Bargès, p. 82, Z. 7) und setzt im Commentar dafür: ארץ ישראל. Abulwalid übersetzt כנען, Ezechiel xvi. 29, mit שאם (Kitāb-ul-uṣūl, Col. 47, Z. 30); ebenso heisst es im *Kitāb al Tārīch* (ed. Neubauer, *Mediaeval Jewish Chronicles*, II, 92) [2]:

[1] *J.Q.R.*, XVIII, 1 ff.

[2] Über das Verhältniss dieser Chronik zu Saadja s. *Revue des Études Juives*, XLIX, 298.

ורגל יקאל לה כנען עמר בלד אלשאם, d. h. der in Gen. x. 6 genannte Kanaan bevölkerte Palästina. Dem Worte אלשאם in Abulwalid's *Kitab-al-Luma'*, p. 269, Z. 11, entspricht in Jehuda Ibn Tibbon's hebr. Übersetzung (*Rikmah*, p. 162, Z. 9): ירושלם. Einen von Abulwalid benützten palästinensischen Bibelcodex bezeichnet er als מצחף שאמי (*Luma'*, p. 238, Z. 10); Ibn Tibbon setzt dafür: מקרא ירושלמית (*Rikmah*, p. 142, Z. 16)[1]. In den arabischen Schlachtregeln (von Samuel Ibn Ğama') heisst der jerusalemische (palästinensische) Talmud: אלתלמוד אלשאמי (s. Geiger's *Jüdische Zeitschrift*, I, 239, Anm. 4). Maimuni hat in seinem Mischna-Commentar überall שאם, wo in den hebräischen Übersetzungen ארץ ישראל steht. — Auch zur Erklärung eines dunkeln-talmudischen Ausdruckes wurde diese specielle Bedeutung von שאם angewendet. Im *Aruch* nämlich heisst es in dem Artikel שמאי (ed. Kohut, VIII, 97), der nur der Erklärung des Ausdruckes פתחי שימאי (Menachoth 33b) gewidmet ist: אומרים בל' ערבי בלד אלשאם והיא ארץ ישראל. Diese Erklärung von שימאי mit "palästinensisch" findet sich auch im Talmudcommentare R. Chananels z. St.; aber er leitet das Wort nicht vom arabischen שאם, sondern vom biblischen Eigennamen שֵׁם ab; פי' שימאי של ארץ ישראל שהיא ארץ בני שם (שימאי also soviel wie 'semitisch'). — Es ist also über jeden Zweifel erhaben, dass כניסת הירושלמיים nur die hebräische Übersetzung von כניסה אלשאמיין ist, dabei bedeutet "jerusalemisch" soviel wie palästinensisch, ganz wie in der Bezeichnung des palästinensischen Targum und des palästinensischen Talmud als "jerusalemisch". Bei *Sanbari* (ed. Neubauer, *M. J. Chr.*, I, 118) heisst es ausdrücklich: ואלה שני בתי כנסיות שזכרנו אחד לאנשי ארץ ישראל כנסת אלשאמיין ואחד כנסת אנשי בבל כנסת אלעראקיין. In Worman's Abhandlung — damit schliesse ich diese Notiz — müsste es statt "Synagogue of the Syrians" immer heissen: "Synagogue of the Palestinians."

Bei dem auf Seite 14 erwähnten Namen von Schulhäuptern und Exilarchen wäre auf meine Abhandlung in *J.Q.R.*, XV, 79, 96. ("Das Gaonat in Palästina und das Exilarchat in Aegypten") zu verweisen. — S. 21, im arabischen Texte, muss statt ريس gelesen werden رئيس und statt "Rīs al-Yahūd" muss es in der Übersetzung heissen: Oberhaupt (Vorsteher) der Juden.

W. Bacher.

[1] S. mein *Leben und Werke des Abulwalid*, S. 51.

II.

In the *J. Q. R.*, XVII, p. 639, I have given a short account of the Massoretic Bible of Moses ben Asher; working, as I explained in the article, far away from my library and from my own books. I have to note that in the *Studia Biblica*, III, p. 36, Neubauer has also given a reproduction of the colophon and of one page of the MS. His photographs, however, have not turned out well; and there is, therefore, no harm done in their having been reproduced. I note also that both Baer and Wickes hold that this is not a MS. of Moses ben Asher, not even of his school, since the accentuation does not agree with the known rules of that scholar. Saphir and Baer are of opinion that the characters employed in the MS. are Spanish, and that therefore the codex is of Western European origin; an opinion which Neubauer very properly rejects. I can only say that the ornamentations upon a few of its pages are very similar in general character and appearance to those published on Plates 1-4 in Günzberg's "L'Ornement hébreu" (St. Petersburg MS. of the year 930), from a MS. which probably was written either in Syria or Mesopotamia. I note further that in an article published in the *Zeitschr. für Assyriologie*, XIV, pp. 293 et seq., Merx has printed the final Massorah from the codex of the year 1028, described by me on pp. 627, 628 of the aforementioned article. It is strange to read that he was able to see nothing of the other MSS. kept in the Karaite synagogue at Cairo. I have no special knowledge of the Massorah, and cannot enter into a controversy as regards the ascription of the MS. to Moses ben Asher. If the scholars above mentioned are right, it is curious, to say the least, that the same fate has befallen Moses ben Asher as has befallen Aaron ben Asher, for Wickes ("A treatise on the accentuation of the Prose Books of the Old Testament," pp. vii et seq.) and others believe that the famous Aleppo MS. is falsely ascribed to Aaron.

RICHARD GOTTHEIL.

III.

I find the following on p. 363 of the January number of the *Jewish Quarterly Review*:—"'Word-peddling' and 'date-mongering' are terms which Mr. Wiener may apply to critical methods if he so delights, but it is not too much to ask that sincerity and honesty be attributed also to those who use them." I gladly leave my readers to judge of tbe truth of the reviewer's other statements and com-

ments, but as this one affects my personal character I ask you to publish this communication.

The suggestion that I have attributed insincerity or dishonesty to any critic is entirely baseless. Further, I did my best to prevent the possibility of any such inference being drawn from the evidence I adduced, by writing the following:—"Nobody will question the excellence of their intentions; nobody will suggest that any critic would willingly be guilty of the slightest falsehood; but can it fairly be said that the work we have examined shows that its authors possess the qualities of observing accurately and impartially, and reporting correctly the results of their observation?"—[*Studies in Biblical Law*, pp. 32–3.]

HAROLD M. WIENER.

IV.

The valuable notes by Professor Bacher and Dr. Porges (*J. Q. R.*, XVIII, 146 seq.) do not exhaust the rectifications that may be made in Professor Gottheil's article on the Cairo MSS. (*J. Q. R.*, XVII, 609 seq.). May I be permitted to add a few more? Not all the MSS. described by G. were unknown before. Besides Jacob Saphir, Professor Merx, in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, XIV, 293 seq. (in which issue, by the way, Professor Gottheil also appears as a contributor), in his article "Die Schlussmassora aus dem Cairiner Codex vom Jahre 1028" (No. 13 in G.'s list), mentions also Nos. 16 and 34 shown him by the Chief Rabbi of the Karaites, whom he calls Shabtay (G., page 611, Cheleby) Mangouby. Six of the MSS. were described by Dr. Harkavy in his חדשים גם ישנים, VI (reprint from הפסגה).

P. 616, end. The *Jewish Encyclopedia*, I, 637–8, states the generally well-known fact that the Antiochus-Megilla is to be found in editions and MSS. of parts of the Bible. Besides the MSS. mentioned in Note 3, we find the Megilla in Biblical MSS. in Hamburg, Leipzig, Paris, Parma, Turin, &c. (cp. Gaster's edition, pp. 15–16).

P. 616, n. 1. As a proof of the interest occasionally taken by Jews in the Gentile Bible, G. mentions a British Museum MS. containing a list of eighteen passages in which the translators of the LXX are said to have altered the text. We find the same list also in other MSS., e.g. Cod. Munich, 392, but it is proof of their interest only for very ancient times; cp. *Mekilta*, ed. Friedmann, 15 b, *Megilla*, 9 a, *Exodus Rabba*, V, 5, and other parallel passages.

P. 617 Copyists of the Hillel family are not so entirely unknown as G. thinks. Neubauer, *Studia Biblica*, III, 23 f., states that a

St. Petersburg MS. of the Hagiographa was written by a Moses ben Hillel in 994.

P. 619. No. 5 is mentioned by Harkavy (l. c. 8, No. 1), who reads correctly ארבעת אלפים, and also saw that Kislew 4949 was 1188.

P. 625, No. 10. A Lisbon edition of the Earlier Prophets is unknown; it is probably ed. Leiria 1494.

Ibid., No. 11. G. mentions a MS. of the Mishna ending with the ninth chapter of Mishpaṭim, הסוכר (sic) את הפועלים. As there is no treatise Mishpaṭim in the Mishna, it is doubtless a copy of Maimonides' *Mishneh Torah*, ending with Mishpaṭim IX, probably that of the third part mentioned in Ibn Saphir, I, 12 a.

Pp. 625–7, No. 12. One of the two Hilleli-Codices in G.'s article is mentioned by Harkavy (l. c., No. 2), who states that the frontispiece of the second volume, as well as the date at the end, are late forgeries, and that the MS. is written in a German hand. Saphir (l. c.) recognized the handwriting of a contemporary writer of Jerusalem in the epigraph, and says that the MS. was dated "under Solyman" (1521 seq.), and bears no other date.

P. 627, No. 13. The statement that the MS. extends "from Chronicles to Ezra and Nehemiah" deserves the amplification given to it by Merx, l. c., p. 294, who informs us that between Chronicles and Ezra are all the Hagiographa, and that the MS. in the poetical books often has only two columns. Merx also prints the colophon as Harkavy does (l. c., p. 10, No. 4), and besides gives the Massoretic notes at the end of the MS. (l. c. 310–30).

P. 632, No. 18. Mishael ben Uzziel, who is the author of an Arabic treatise on the differences between Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali (cf. Harkavy, חדשים גם ישנים, II, pp. 10 and 12), lived in the twelfth century. A letter of his to a R. Ḥananel, a Genizah MS., was published in *Z. f. H. B.*, IV, 155–8; cp. ibid., 186, Steinschneider, *Arab. Literatur*, § 167.

P. 636, No. 27. In Harkavy, l.c., p. 10, No. 5, the note by the scribe is given, and the part now illegible reads: למי ישמר דרך אמונים שדי ישקיף משמי מעונים לרחם עמו זה כמה שנים אמן. Samuel ben Jacob is the writer of the famous Bible MS. of 1009 in the St. Petersburg Library (Harkavy and Strack's *Catalogue*, p. 269)[1], the handwriting according to Harkavy being the same. The same library has also a Pentateuch with Massora and Saadia's translation written by him (Harkavy, ibid.).

[1] In 1134 this MS. was bought by ... בר .. מצליח הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב שלמה הכהן ראש ישיבת גאון יעקב, who is known to us through Prof. Schechter's *Saadyana*, pp. 81, 115, 116. Cf. also E. J. Worman in *J. Q. R.*, XVIII, p. 14.

P. 638, No. 30. The note on Lev. x. 16 is that of the small Massora; the reading of the Florence MS. (note 1) is that of our editions of *Maseket Soferim*, IX, 2.

Ibid., No. 33. The commentary, of which a specimen is given, is by Rashi.

Pp. 639–41, No. 349. Harkavy, l. c., pp. 8–10, No. 3. Neubauer, l. c., 25 seq. The date on p. 640, l. 18, Harkavy reads את״מא (1130). G.'s identification of 1443 (Sel) = 1684 has been criticized by Porges. That 827 since the destruction of the second temple, the supposed date of the MS., is 895 (not 897), is shown by Neubauer and Harkavy. The latter has four inscriptions not to be found in G.'s article. P. 640, l. 21, Harkavy reads דויד בן . . יפת נכר אלסכנדרי, a name which occurs also in one of the inscriptions not mentioned by G., and he explains הנודע בכנוי = נכר אלסכנדרי, "who is known under the name the 'Alexandrian.'" Another inscription begins זה הדפתר הנביאים שהקדיש אותו יעבץ בן שלמה אלכלפי, and Harkavy thinks that he is a different person from the יעבץ בן שלמה הבבלי, who was not a Karaite, and did not write out the Tetragrammaton, as is done in the inscriptions of his Karaite namesake. In Neubauer's article a poor facsimile of the colophon, printed upside down at that, is to be found together with a facsimile of 1 Sam. iv. 15–v. 8. Neubauer, p. 25, states that Baer and Wickes conclude from the mode of accentuation that the MS. cannot have been written by a Massorete of Ben Asher's school, and gives some proofs. He concludes from the facsimile that it is written in the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth century, and says that Harkavy shares his opinion. Curiously enough, Harkavy (l. c.) believes in its authenticity.

P. 641, No. 37, read מנהר״א. A copy of this collection was in Azulai's possession; cp. שם הגדולים, ed. Benjakob, p. 7 a.

P. 642, No. 39, read מוהר״י. The author is called ישועה שבאבו ידיע זיין by Azulai, l. c., p. 55 d.

Ibid., No. 40, is a collection of Responsa printed in Leghorn, 1783.

Ibid., No. 45. The note at the end is that of the printer Parentz to his edition of the text of the *Ḥoshen Mishpat.*, Venice, 1574. Are the notes of Jacob Castro, that is, the מהריק״ש, printed on the whole of the *Shulḥan 'Aruk*, Constantinople, 1718, added to a copy of this edition?

P. 644, No. 53. Probably an Arabic translation of the well-known רזיאל.

Ibid. No. 54 is not on the Pentateuch, but on Ibn Ezra's commentary to the Pentateuch. It is the צפנת פענח; cp. Steinschneider,

Cat. Bodl., 2556; Friedlaender, *Essays on the Writings of Ibn Ezra*, 221–6.

Ibid., No. 58. According to the description of the contents, the תפוחי זהב is probably Melli's well-known printed extract of the ראשית חכמה. Was Josef Ergas the owner of the MS.?

P. 649, No. 70. Cp. Harkavy (l. c., p. 3, No. 24), who reads the name זלה"ה אנדוראן דשפונין: . . and the date שמונים ושתים לפרט האלף הששי (1322).

P. 650 seq. The passage of Saphir referred to on p. 651, note 3, shows that the epigraph is a copy of the Aleppo Codex with corrections by Firkowitz, who changed הנודע בן בויאעא into בן ירוחם; cp. also Harkavy, l. c., pp. 6–7, and Graetz, *Monatsschrift*, 1875, p. 5 seq. Perhaps Firkowitz copied the note in the Jerusalem MS.

ALEXANDER MARX.